



The United Kingdom Alliance.

A FULL REPORT OF THE SPEECHES

DELIVERED AT THE
ANNUAL PUBLIC MEETING,
HELD IN THE
LARGE ROOM OF THE FREE TRADE HALL,
MANCHESTER,

On WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 26th, 1870,

SIR CHARLES E. TREVELYAN, K.C.B.

(Ex-Governor of Madras), in the Chair.

PRICE FOURPENCE.

London :
R. NEWTON, 7, DUKE STREET, WEST SMITHFIELD, E.C.

Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2015

SPEECHES, &c.

The CHAIRMAN—Ladies and Gentlemen: Before opening the proceedings, I will mention that numerous letters have been received expressing hearty concurrence with the objects of the Alliance, and great regret at not being able to attend, but only two of those letters have been selected as representative. They are from the head of the Church of England and from the head of the Church of Rome in this country. First of all I will read the letter of the Archbishop of Canterbury, which is addressed to Archdeacon Sandford:—

“My Dear Archdeacon,—I understand you are about to attend the annual meeting of the United Kingdom Alliance, and I am anxious to express to you my unabated interest in the great object which you have in view. I do not, indeed, feel that I can concur in all the plans by which the Alliance seeks to promote temperance, and better the condition of those who at present suffer so severely from the evil with which the Alliance grapples; but you have my hearty good wishes in the main object which you seek.” (Cheers.)

And then the letter from Archbishop Manning:—

“I am truly sorry that it is out of my power to be in Manchester to-morrow to support you at the United Kingdom Alliance. Pray assure the meeting that nothing but inevitable duties would have hindered my being present, and that my desire to work onward to our great and common end increases year by year.”

Now, ladies and gentlemen, you will, perhaps, ask why, being neither a member of the Alliance nor a total abstainer, I have felt it my duty to accept the honour of taking the chair at this great meeting. I have been actively engaged in public affairs for more than forty years, and during this long period one observation has been constantly forced upon me—whatever plan of moral or social improvement might be proposed, this national vice of inebriety has always crossed our path. To abstain from intoxicating liquors is a cardinal point both of the Hindoo and Mahometan religion. Conceive, therefore, the effect produced upon the spread of Christianity in the East, by the disgraceful exhibition constantly seen in the bazaars of Calcutta, Madras, and Bombay, of Christians rolling about in a state of beastly intoxication. Even the young men educated in our colleges imitate our evil example, to the scandal of their Hindoo parents, and it has been reserved for the Hindoo reformer, Keshub Chunder Sen, to bring them back to a sense of the duty of temperance. The same monster evil meets us in every attempt to improve the administration of our army. The recruiting is conducted in public-houses; a portion of the soldier's pay is issued as “beer money;” and the officers receive “the Prince Regent's allowance of wine,” His Royal Highness having graciously expressed his desire “that no officer should be so poor as not to be able to drink his pint of wine a day.” There are eight or nine public-houses in the immediate vicinity of the barracks of the household cavalry at Knightsbridge, besides two music halls, the character of which I will not describe. Can we wonder, then, that our army is doubly dyed with this miserable taint, and that its fruits are reaped in vice, disease,

absence from duty, desertion, and an unusually large deduction from available strength under the heads of hospital treatment and punishment? All agree that no drunken men are to be seen among the German troops in France. But how would it be if an English army took the field under like circumstances? The answer may be given in the words of a recent report upon the Red River Expedition: "When we first arrived, Fort Garry was in a state of mud, and the consequences next morning were very distressing. It was so long since the men had tasted liquor, that all who could, troops or voyageurs, went off to make up for lost time. Very little Winnipeg liquor is sufficient to overturn the strongest head and demoralise the steadiest legs, so that in a short time the streets were filled with recumbent figures. When a man fell, one side became a large cake of mud; when he picked himself up to fall on the other side, he was sandwiched in Winnipeg earth, and the next morning was encased in a thick hard coating from which he was with difficulty released. Pickets were sent out all through the evening to bring the men in." In the endeavours made to improve the condition of the lower orders of our people in town and country, the same demon of intoxication constantly rises and bars the way. The east end of London has acquired an unhappy pre-eminence in pauperism, but there is no part of England where the liquor traffic is in such a flourishing state. Within the square mile investigated by Mr. Bartley there are 165 public-houses, and the same number of beer-houses, taking, on a very moderate estimate, at least £450,000 a year, while the school fee of twopence on every child would have amounted only to £10,053, or less than 2½ per cent. on the drink account. It has become a lucrative business in that part of London to establish public-houses and beer-houses in favourable situations and to sell them again at a profit. When this vicious habit has taken possession of a population, charitable assistance only feeds the distemper. "The lady has brought another shilling's-worth of charitable gin," indicates the object to which such charity is usually applied. The practice of issuing cider in aid of wages is the curse of my native district in the West of England, because it gives a public sanction to its constant use, and fixes a bad habit in the labouring population which is certain to lead to further indulgence. I can endorse every word of an appeal which has lately been made by a West Country clergyman to your honoured president. "May I not, then, entreat you to use your powerful influence to stem a tide against which all the efforts of a clergyman are useless? We may preach and warn as we will; but what is the use when from seven years old the people are trained to drink? And that drink, extra drink, takes the place of wholesome food to them; and, if any harder work has to be done, more drink is the one specific." It will now be understood why I stand here to give such support as I am able to the United Kingdom Alliance. I entirely agree with the Bishop of Exeter, who presided on this occasion last year, that "there is no other evil at present in this country so deadly in its operation as the drunkenness that prevails among us;" and "this one cause of unhappiness and crime is equal in its bad effects to all the other causes put together." We have, moreover, arrived at a crisis of the question which demands that all minor differences of opinion should for the present be set aside, and that we should unite in giving effect to those main points on which we are all agreed. I can remember the last traditions of the drinking habits among the upper classes. Their most ordinary after-dinner talk was about the wines before them, and those who could drink their three bottles of wine in England, or their dozen of

beer in India, were counted as heroes. Now the gentlemen of England are, as a class, decidedly temperate, and if the rest of the population were like them, this question would not have arisen. This change has been brought about entirely by moral means. Vulgar sensuality has given way before the increased prevalence of intellectual pursuits and a higher standard of duty. But a still greater change has commenced. The working men of England have pronounced against our national vice, and have determined to employ against it the increased political influence they have obtained under the new franchise. There is more difficulty, however, in this case. We have had nothing which deserves to be called a system of national education, and, not having the same intellectual resources as those who are in a higher social position, working men have a natural distrust in their power of self-restraint. Following the teaching of divine wisdom, they pray, "Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." Returning home exhausted by his day's work, a man may pass one or two public-houses, but it is hard that the temptation should be indefinitely renewed, with all the attractions of warm fires and brilliant lights. Then there is the class below the working men, composed of habitual idlers and vagrants, and persons of all sorts who live by preying upon society; and as these can only be dealt with by police regulation, public-houses and beer-houses ought to be brought within such limits as will allow of effectual control. This demand of the working classes has been endorsed by the authorities specially charged with the care of religion and morality. The Archbishop of York presides over a "National Association for the Amendment of the Laws Relating to the Liquor Traffic." A committee of convocation has investigated the subject in great detail, and has made a report recommending, among other things, that "a legal power of restraining the issue or renewal of licences should be placed in the hands of the persons most deeply interested and affected." The Wesleyan Conference, which represents the free church of the people, has expressed its opinion that "the facilities afforded for the opening of public-houses and beer-houses, and the temptations presented by them, especially to the young and the intemperate, render the effects of the present law grossly demoralising, and constitute a legalised hindrance to the efforts of Christian churches. The conference therefore declares its judgment that a reform of the present licensing system is absolutely necessary, and that in any measure which may be hereafter adopted provision shall be made, in harmony with a recognised principle of self-government, that the ratepayers, who bear the charges resulting from the prevalence of intemperance and its consequent pauperism and crime, shall also have the power to control the issue of licences for the sale of intoxicating drinks within their respective districts." And the Reformed Presbyterian Synod of Ireland and other religious bodies have declared themselves to the same effect. Last, not least, the Government has pledged itself "to bring in a measure dealing with the whole of this subject at the very earliest period next year;" and this pledge was accompanied by the important announcement that, as public-houses and beer-houses had been unduly multiplied, "some measure of restriction for the future must be devised, and it would be of very great advantage if, in so restricting them, we could give effect to the popular will, expressed in a guarded and legitimate manner, and if, without injury to existing interests, we could secure a gradual reduction in the number of existing public-houses and beer-houses in places where, by common consent, they are too numerous." Mr. Bruce lately

repeated this pledge in my presence at Glasgow. He promised to bring in a comprehensive measure within the first fortnight of the session, and he added these emphatic words :—" My belief is that the people of England are deeply desirous to see this question well settled ; that there is hardly any question of domestic policy which so interests them. I doubt whether, if we take the majority of our countrymen, we will find that there is any question which so deeply interests them as the best mode of dealing with the liquor traffic. They feel that drunkenness is not only a disgrace to the classes who unfortunately are betrayed into it, but that it is an injury to their families, and that it is, beyond all other obstacles to civilisation, the greatest. I am most anxious, therefore, to carry an effectual measure to deal with this great question, and I am anxious that it should have every chance of being passed." I heartily congratulate you on the advanced position you have reached in the advocacy of your cause. But new circumstances bring new duties with them. Your principle has been accepted by the Government and by the majority of your countrymen. There is, therefore, no longer any necessity for popular agitation of the ordinary kind. The object now should be to rally to your standard all who are fighting on the same side under different banners, so that your association may become, in a true sense, the " United Kingdom Alliance," and that the great weight of the Alliance may strengthen the Government measure by infusing into it as much as possible of the permissive principle. All laws which are in advance of public opinion are soon disregarded or changed. Your undertaking is essentially progressive, and although you may look upon the Government measure only as a step towards your plan, yet you will rejoice in that step being taken, and in your having succeeded in bringing your countrymen to think that the power of restriction should be vested in any degree in popular hands. Let us see where we stand. Two Acts were passed on the principle of free trade in intoxicating drinks—the Duke of Wellington's Beer Act of 1830, and Mr. Gladstone's Wine Act of 1860. In 1830 it was the generally received opinion that the multiplication of beer-houses would diminish the consumption of spirits, but that Act turned out a miserable failure, and a further stimulus to the taste for drinking has, I fear, been given by Mr. Gladstone's Act. It is painful to see women and young people asking in the pastry-cooks' shops for what is called sherry, but is really bad spirits more or less diluted ; and the grocers' carts, by means of samples, diffuse the taste throughout the rural districts. The principle of these Acts has been completely reversed by Sir Selwin Ibbetson's Act of 1869, by which the entire responsibility of licensing houses where intoxicating liquors may be drunk has been given back to the magistrates, with power to grant or refuse as they see fit. This is the permissive veto power, which contemplates any degree of restriction that may be required for the public good, only, instead of being vested in the people themselves, it is vested in the magistrates as their trustees and representatives. The Public-house Closing Acts of 1864 and 1865 were another practical acknowledgment of the same principle. Municipal councils, improvement commissioners, and local boards under the Public Health and Local Government Acts, are authorised by these Acts to direct the closing of all places for the sale of exciseable liquors within their respective jurisdictions, between the hours of one and four in the morning. This is, indeed, a small instalment, but it marks an important principle. The bill introduced in 1867 by the members for Liverpool proposed to empower the magistrates to refuse any fresh license or transfer of

license in any case where three-fourths in number, and not less than one hundred of the owners and occupiers of property within one hundred yards of the premises signed a memorial objecting to the license. This bill did not pass because it proposed to deal with a general question by mere local measure, but it is important as having been brought forward, not specially by teetotalers, but by those interested in maintaining good order in the town, and because Mr. Gladstone and Mr. Bruce have promised that the provisions of the Liverpool Bill shall not be overlooked in framing any measure to be brought forward with ministerial sanction. There seems to be no difficulty about what may be called the question of primary jurisdiction. It is admitted that, so long as licenses are granted, they should be granted by the magistrates. Whatever exception may be taken to individual magistrates, yet, as a class, they fairly represent the opinion of the country. They are responsible for the repression of crime and have the best means of knowing how it may be checked; and they have shown, by the manner in which they have exercised their powers under Sir Selwin Ibbetson's Act, that they are alive to the need of restriction, for a large number of beer-houses have been closed, and applications for licenses have been refused in still greater proportion. It is also now admitted on all hands that the ratepayers should exercise some influence over the grant of licenses, because they best know what the wants of their respective districts really are, and they have to bear the burden of the pauperism and crime which are the certain consequences of an ill-regulated state of the liquor traffic. But does it necessarily follow from this that the ratepayers should assemble in person to exercise this function, either in parish vestry or in any larger territorial division? The answer to this question appears to me to furnish the key to the whole subject. The exercise of administrative powers by the body of the people belongs to an elementary state of political progress. The ancient republics were conducted on this principle; and, after a turbulent existence characterised by violent changes and frequent oppression of the minority by the majority, they took refuge in despotism. Neither has the revival of the principle of late years, under the form of the plebiscite, been a success. The representative principle is the great political discovery of modern times. It is this which has reconciled liberty with order, and rendered it possible for Government to be conducted in a steady course of progressive improvement. Having this cause greatly at heart, I should tremble if it were subjected to an ordeal such as some of its friends propose for it. Although the subject still partakes of the character of a speculative general question, we see with what warmth it is debated between the advocates of total prohibition on one side, and of free trade on the other. Conceive, therefore, what the excitement would be if the point to be decided was, whether the sale of strong drink should be permitted or prohibited in a particular parish, union, or town! Then the question of property enters largely into the controversy. The possession of a license often doubles the value of a house; and the ratepayers, with their strong local interests, would be pressed by every possible motive to grant a license to this or the other candidate. I should be sorry to see such an apple of discord thrown even among town councils and boards of guardians, the members of which are elected from a variety of considerations totally alien to this question. Such a purely local system must be characterised by striking inequalities, and its tendency would be to oscillate violently between two extremes. A sound permanent system, which would operate firmly and equally over the whole country, and would be

susceptible of steady development, can only be arrived at by the application of the electoral principle to considerable districts. As guardians are elected by the ratepayers for the care of the poor, and town councillors for the health and general well-being of the urban populations, so, in my opinion, should commissioners be selected by them to determine, in the last resort, that question upon which both the others essentially depend. One or two commissioners might be selected for each union, and the unions might be so grouped that each representative board might be acquainted with the circumstances of its district and be amenable to local public opinion. As the board would exercise a veto upon the licenses granted by the magistrates, without having itself any initiative, it would be all powerful for restriction, but could not, under any influence, grant a license when the magistrates had refused one. The opinions of the ratepayers would be reflected in the representatives chosen by them, but their action would not stop there. It would be their duty and privilege to put the benches of magistrates and the licensing boards in full possession of the circumstances of each neighbourhood and of the feelings and wishes of the inhabitants, and they would promote the cause of temperance and good order by supporting the administration of the law by memorials and deputations at least as much as by their exercise of their electoral power. But, however necessary legislation may be, we must not forget that Divine wisdom has shown us a more excellent way. Neither the teetotal pledge nor the permissive veto can supply the place of habitual self-restraint. Until we learn to use the gifts of God as not abusing them, we are the helpless creatures of circumstances rather than moral agents. "Be not like dumb driven cattle; be a hero in the strife." In this higher and final point of view, it is well that satisfactory provision has been made for national education previously to the settlement of the great question. The two measures will stand shoulder to shoulder in the contest with evil. If I do not misinterpret my countrymen, they by no means intend to confine themselves to teaching the three *R*'s in their new enterprise of comprehensive national education. There will be moral training as well as intellectual cultivation. Habits of prudence and manly self-respect will be encouraged, and resources will be created the want of which, more than anything else, leads to habits of inebriety. The people's park, the public library, the workmen's club, the mechanics' institute, the savings' bank and benefit society, the study of the political and social problems which so deeply concern us, will all act as antidotes to this national vice, provided only that the young are prepared by an education extending to the whole man, with all his tastes and capabilities, and not merely directed to the mechanical attainments of reading, writing, and arithmetic.

Mr. RAPER—Sir Charles, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I am requested by the business committee of the council to announce to you, in brief terms, what has been done during this annual council meeting to-day, and I take the opportunity at once to thank you for kindly acceding to our request to allow that full statement which we have desired at the hands of Sir Chas. Trevelyan to be placed before the public. You are aware, ladies, and gentlemen, that ours is not a narrow platform in any sense of the term. We are in the habit of having chairmen who begin as Sir Charles has done and end as Dr. Temple did. Dr. Temple, speaking at the Permissive Bill meeting in Exeter over which he presided, hoped that the bill would pass through the House of Commons, and when it came to the Upper House he would vote for it with all his heart. Sir Charles Trevelyan has done what he can-

He has sent a son into Parliament, who voted for it last year. I have now to state that at half-past eight this morning as many of the general council as could be present met the executive at breakfast, and at ten o'clock the council meeting commenced at which nearly 500 members were present, and the following resolutions were passed:—

“That this council feels profoundly grateful to Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., the Right Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., and their four colleagues, who, in the recent session of Parliament, introduced the Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, and to the whole of the 115 honourable members who voted or paired in support of the bill on the motion for a second reading. The council recognises in the fact, that the clear majority against the bill of 106 in 1869, was reduced to 31 in 1870, encouraging evidence that the agitation promoted by the Alliance is rapidly changing public opinion, and regards it as justifying the anticipation that the principle of Sir Wilfrid Lawson's bill will shortly receive the sanction of the Legislature.”

Another important resolution was to this effect:—

“That this council, anticipating that the Home Secretary will perform his promise, to introduce a comprehensive measure dealing with the sale of intoxicating liquors, early in the next session of Parliament, calls most earnestly upon all the members and friends of the Alliance, temperance associations, social, sanitary, and moral reformers, friends of education, religion, and progress, to put forth their utmost efforts to secure provisions in the bill, enabling the people to remove the temptations of the liquor traffic from their respective neighbourhoods.”

Another was to this effect:—

“That this council rejoices that Sir Wilfrid Lawson has given notice for the early introduction of his Permissive Prohibitory Liquor Bill, and pledges its earnest and strenuous co-operation with the executive to carry forward the agitation, so as to create and concentrate a still more enlightened and resolute public opinion adverse to the liquor traffic; and by means of public meetings, conferences, deputations and memorials to members of Parliament and candidates, by numerous signed petitions to the Legislature, and by all other suitable methods of organised electoral action, to bring an amount of pressure to bear upon members of Parliament that will make it easy for them to do right, and difficult to do wrong, upon this question of primary importance and most urgent necessity.”

The last one I wish to trouble you with is to the effect:—

“That this council gratefully accepts the numerous expressions of sympathy and co-operation in its work, from various religious organisations, conferences, assemblies, and synods, and especially the resolution of the last Wesleyan Conference, in response to a memorial forwarded from the executive of the Alliance. The council also heartily approves the arrangement of executive to publish a People's Edition of the Report of the Committee of Convocation of the Province of Canterbury on intemperance and its remedies, and calls upon temperance societies and religious bodies to aid in giving that most important document a national circulation, as an excellent means of ensuring the early triumph of the movement.”

These four resolutions, with other six made ten, and then an important one was passed, which I am bound to read to you. It is to this effect:—

“That the members and friends of the Alliance be most earnestly requested to intimate as early as possible the amount they will con-

tribute for the year's operations; and this council resolves to co-operate with the executive in raising adequate financial resources to carry forward the agitation with increased vigour and efficiency.'

That resolution was passed by the members of the general council then present, from England, Ireland, Scotland, and Wales. Immediately that subscription list was opened the mover of the resolution (Mr. Benj. Whitworth) stated that he had come to the conclusion that it was his duty to increase his subscription from what it had been—£600 for five years—up to £800 for the next year. (Great applause.) These amounts of above £10, as you are aware (I am now speaking to those who have been subscribers and for the information of those who are anxious to be), are called for quarterly, and Mr. Whitworth thought £800 would be easier divided into four parts than anything he could do. Under these circumstances the list was opened this morning. Sir Walter Trevelyan and Sir Wilfrid Lawson followed the example of Mr. Whitworth, and these names stand at the head of the list for £800 each for the next year. As you are aware, the five years' guarantee fund effected five years ago terminated this morning. Upwards of £50,000 have been subscribed during the five years, and a large portion of that amount has been duly disbursed. Some of the guarantees, however, did not commence until a year or two had passed. They are still running on, and, including two or three subscriptions which I am going to read to you, the total amount subscribed to be placed in the hands of the executive council, so far as to-day's proceedings are concerned, was £6,000. After the three £800 we have—

Mr. Charles Jupe, of Mere	£400
„ Charles Pease, of Darlington	100
„ Arthur Pease „	100
„ Gurney Pease „	100
„ Edward Pease „	100
„ Ewing, of Gloucester	100
„ Hugh Mason, of Ashton	100
„ Wm. Saunders, of London	100
„ Robert Charleton, of Bristol	60
„ Alderman Harvey, of Salford	50
„ Wm. Hargreaves, of Sheffield	50
„ Abraham Sharman „	50
„ Wm. Hoyle, of Tottington	50

I do not wish to detain you longer; therefore I will not go below £50, although I believe there are some much more handsome subscriptions, *proportionately*, lower down the long list which I hold in my hand. The whole will be published in the United Kingdom Alliance organ next week—not this—and I mention that fact in order that you who have not had an opportunity of saying for how much you are going to enter in this grand speculation, may have an opportunity of being entered in the list then. With that information of the day's work, you are now in a condition to go on to the resolutions of the evening.

MR. HUGH BIRLEY, M.P.—Sir Charles Trevelyan, Ladies and Gentlemen: The national evil which we have assembled to consider, and to which we desire to apply a sound and efficient remedy, is one of no doubtful or imaginary character. Its existence is apparent in all our streets, and the avowed conviction on the minds of all thinking men of whatever opinions in other respects is this—“something must be done.” It must be done speedily—it must be done effectively. (Cheers.) The Home Secretary, as you have heard, has promised that within the first few weeks after the

assembling of the new Parliament he will introduce a bill of a comprehensive character, to carry out, as far as may be, public opinion upon this subject. I only trust that it will be sufficiently well considered and sufficiently comprehensive to carry out the views of those who have thought most deeply upon it. (Applause.) Now, ladies and gentlemen, I am sorry to say that this evil is still a growing evil. There is, at any rate, too much reason to think so. I have, for instance, the testimony of Mr. Ashworth, at the Salford Hundred Quarter Sessions on Monday last, that there has been a very great increase of late years in the prisoners in the county gaol, and that this increase is far more than commensurate with the increase of the population, and that it has been caused mainly by intemperance; and, to aggravate, if possible, this sad state of things, it is also added that there has been a very large proportionate increase of female intemperance. Now, ask yourselves what is to be the condition of a nation if any large proportion of the population—and especially the women—should be sunk in habits of gross intoxication? It is necessary, above all things, that we should encourage public opinion among all classes to stamp the intemperate man as a degraded man. I am told that at the Borough Court it is very common for prisoners on their trials for cases of light assault, for instance, to palliate their guilt by stating that they were very drunk at the time, and they will actually appeal to the witnesses to say whether they were not very drunk indeed, as if that would constitute a sufficient excuse. This is a state of feeling that we should endeavour to eradicate; for say what you will, and argue as you may, whatever laws may be passed by the legislature of this country—whatever arguments may be enforced from this platform, and however much they may be applauded by a vast and an enthusiastic and resolute audience, such as that which I see before me, and which has from year to year with thorough and determined resolution supported the Alliance movement—I say, in spite of all this authority and all this support, unless you can foster a public opinion among those classes of society peculiarly exposed to habits of intemperance, you will not succeed to the utmost of your desire. It is thought by many that a sound system of education will eradicate the vice of intemperance. I hope much from education, but I have had sufficient experience to enable me to assert that however far you may carry a system of education it will not of itself be sufficient to stamp out this vice. (Cheers.) And what a lamentable vice it is, ladies and gentlemen! I will leave it to the ministers of religion to tell you how they are thwarted in their efforts to carry the minds of the young, or to carry the minds of the old, to another world and their highest hopes, but I will ask you to look to the family itself. In times like these it is scarcely possible to make a speech without referring to that terrible war which is devastating some of the fairest provinces of Europe. You have been told just now by our chairman that the German soldiers have not shown those habits of intoxication which, he fears, would have been manifested by English soldiers under similar circumstances; but it is not to this that I would now refer. You have read—and I have no doubt you have read feelingly—how often it has happened in France that a small body of German cavalry soldiers—the Uhlans, as they are termed—have come to some small open town or village, made a small requisition, and have been followed by a larger band, which has taken more and more of the provisions, of the furniture, and of the clothing of the people; how this has been followed by increasing forces, until at last the poor people have been robbed not only of their daily bread, but of their seed-corn, of their implements,

of their tools, of their clothes, and of almost everything which constituted their life. And it seems to me that we have an enemy such as this in the midst of us in intemperance. Appealing to the family—coming first by slow steps—coming cautiously, until it ends in intoxication. At first it may be that a small sum is abstracted from the earnings of the family—earnings which were intended to minister to the comfort and to the convenience of the whole household. How gradually the habit increases, until more and more of the weekly wages is thrown into the hands of the drink-seller, or is snatched, I should say, by this demon enemy, until at last nearly the whole of it is so absorbed, and the wife and the children are left almost destitute of clothing and daily bread. Such, I believe, is no exaggerated picture of the evil which is going on in the midst of us, and you are now asked, and the legislature is asked, and all the thinking people of this country are desired to arouse themselves, to remove, if possible, some of the temptations which are the great cause of this horrible mischief. I firmly believe that our working people are peculiarly exposed to these temptations. After having performed a hard day's labour in crowded shops and crowded towns, it is a great trial to their self-denial to abstain from stimulants which they know to be pernicious and destructive both to soul and body; and many of those people who are addicted to these habits earnestly pray us, if possible, to remove this temptation from them. The licensing laws themselves admit that this is a subject which ought not to be treated like the supply of bread or groceries or butchers' meat, and surely there is great reason in stating—as has been urged already—that the rate-payers are themselves the people who have the greatest interest in this subject, and a full right, therefore, to have a voice—and a very important voice—in this question. (Great applause.) I will not longer detain you, for there are many speakers to follow me. Many of them are men who have worked from the first hour in the day, whilst I am coming in, as it were, at the eleventh hour. I will simply, therefore, read to you the resolution which I have to propose. It is—

“That in view of the fact that the drinking habits and drunkenness of the nation constitute a vast impediment to all enterprises for the moral, intellectual, and social amelioration of the people, whether by the reduction of pauperism and crime or the promotion of education and an improved sanitary condition of the community, this meeting calls upon philanthropists, social reformers, and legislators to aid the efforts which are being made to apply an effectual remedy to this great national evil.” (Cheers.)

Sir WILFRID LAWSON, Bart., M.P.—Mr. Chairman, you have just alluded to others than yourself who have been engaged in the movement which calls us together to-night—longer than you have been. I want, in beginning my speech, to quote to you the words of one who has been engaged in this movement from its very commencement. Seventeen years ago a banquet was held in Northumberland in honour of Sir George Grey, who was not long since one of Her Majesty's Secretaries of State. That banquet was attended by Sir Walter Trevelyan. In a speech which he made he alluded to this town and to the United Kingdom Alliance in the following words:—“I am happy to announce that in that important town of Manchester, where originated the celebrated and mighty league which ended with the abolition of the corn laws, there is now organising another mighty league which will, I trust, be as victorious as its predecessor, and succeed in removing from our dear fatherland a much greater curse.” Those words, as far as I know, are the first which were ever

uttered in favour of the prohibition of the liquor traffic in any large or significant political assemblage. I say that those were at that time of day, courageous words. (Hear, hear.) Sir Walter Trevelyan deserves our thanks for not heeding the nicknames, the cries of "fanatic," and "fool" which were sure to be raised against him, and for standing up in an assembly of his fellow-countrymen for what he knew to be right, although it might be unpopular. (Hear.) It is very easy for us to come here and speak now; but things were different in those days; and if the words were courageous, I think I may congratulate Sir Walter to-night on their being prophetic; for when he looks back on the events of the last few years, when he reads in the press what is going on in public affairs with regard to our question, and when he looks around this mighty assembly, as enthusiastic and as determined to win as ever it was on any former occasion—(hear)—he must feel that the realisation of the prophecy which he ventured to utter on that occasion cannot be delayed for very many years longer. But that sentence of Sir Walter's shows that we have been fighting this battle already for 17 years. There is something there to shame us. We ought to be ashamed that our great and good object has not been earlier accomplished. But there is something also to encourage us, for during those 17 years in which we have agitated this question, and in which during the latter part of it we have brought the question before Parliament, although we have suffered many a repulse we have never yet suffered a defeat. (Hear.) You have heard to-night that the only measure which absolutely embodies the principles advocated by the United Kingdom Alliance, the principle of the prohibition of the liquor traffic, has been steadily making its way in the House of Commons. The first time such a measure was brought in it was defeated by a majority of seven to one; on the next occasion by a majority of two to one; and on the last occasion by a bare majority of 31, in a house of upwards of 200 members. Those divisions speak for themselves. Now, is it at all surprising that we should never cease in the struggle which we have undertaken, when we see what is going on around us? I was glad to hear our good friend, Mr. Birley, mention the statement which was made last Monday, at the Salford Hundred Quarter Sessions. There Mr. Hibbert and Mr. Edmund Ashworth both stated the melancholy fact that the committals for drunkenness were greatly on the increase, so much so that the committals to prison (and you know that most committals to prison are connected with drunkenness) had doubled within the last ten years. That being the case, is it at all wonderful that Mr. Bruce should have used the words which he did, and say that there was no question, in his opinion, which so much interested the people of this country as the best mode of dealing with the liquor traffic? At any rate, Mr. Bruce's words were perfectly right as regards this part of the country, as is shown by this meeting which I am now addressing. (Hear, hear.) Last year, when I addressed an audience similar to this at our annual meeting, we were all in expectation that Mr. Bruce, who considers this question so important, would do something to deal with it; but I find myself in the same position to-night in which I found myself twelve months ago—waiting for Mr. Bruce. (Laughter.) And what was the reason why Mr. Bruce could not deal with this question this year? Why, he and his colleagues were so busily and laudably engaged in making provision for the education of the children of drunken parents that they had not time to stop the drunkenness of those parents. (Hear.) I hope Mr. Bruce will improve—(laughter)—because he has at present, as a public writer has said, "rather an awkward trick of taking things

into his consideration and keeping them there." (Laughter.) But the time is coming when Mr. Bruce and his colleagues must deal with this question. (Hear.) They can only manage to jog along from year to year by the most vehement protestations that they are getting a bill ready, and will bring it in at the earliest opportunity next session. And I really begin to think—though it is rash, perhaps—that they will at last keep their promise. I judge so from the great alarm which I see is spreading throughout liquordom with regard to this matter. The liquor sellers are getting alarmed. I judge of that because they use strong language. The Wine and Beer Association of Manchester and Salford held a very interesting and instructive meeting here about two months ago, when the vice-president showed his alarm by the strength of his language. He said that "all their subscriptions would be necessary now they had such eternal hypocritical humbugs to contend with in the shape of the teetotalers; with such men as Rylands of Warrington, Bazley, Bright, and Birley, and other humbugs at their back. (Laughter.) He desired the press to tell the teetotalers (a most awful piece of news) that the wine trade, the beer trade, the licensed victuallers, and the brewers were now united together, and resolved to act as one man." That is a very extraordinary thing; because I study the publican literature, and I have always observed that the beer-sellers were looked down upon as a very inferior race of mortals. But now the beersellers have to go and get the magistrates' license, and that at once elevates them to the same moral platform as the victuallers, and these excellent men are "all now united together" "as one man." But what can Mr. Bruce and his colleagues do? What new principle are they going to introduce into the licensing system which shall make it a blessing instead of a curse? That is the problem which they have to solve, and which if they do not solve they will be entitled to have it said of them that their legislation is a failure. We hear now and then that there is to be some sort of elected board; that perhaps the town councillors are to be elected to take part in licensing. Well, but that principle is already virtually in action in Scotland; there is a class of officials whom they call, I believe, "bailies," and they are virtually elected by the ratepayers. Do you find that Scotland is satisfied with her licensing system? On the contrary, strong petitions come up to the House of Commons from Scotland for the Permissive Bill; nay, so earnest are they, that I saw that at one large meeting lately they passed a resolution that they ought at once to go for a Permissive Bill for Scotland itself, and try to win the race from England. If they do win the race, I bid them God speed. (Cheers.) Then we are told that barristers are to save the nation—not revising barristers, but barristers of some sort or other, are to go round and license public-houses. Perhaps many of you do not know that in many parts of Ireland they have these barristers to whom the licensing powers are granted. From Ireland comes up a cry for the Permissive Bill even more strongly than from any other part of the kingdom, and if left to Ireland the Permissive Bill would have been carried by a large majority. Well, others say we shall get on all right by shutting these places on Sunday, Good Friday, Christmas-day, &c. A bill was passed for Scotland a few years ago, providing carefully for these matters, and making most cautious arrangements for the times and seasons when these establishments were to carry on their business; and yet, as I tell you Scotland is far from satisfied, and groans under the liquor traffic as much as any part of the kingdom. We cannot, of course, return to free trade.

Sir Charles Trevelyan knocked that on the head in his speech. He told you that the Beer Bill had been a curse; and Mr. Gladstone's wine measure, if not a curse, had done no good, and was not likely to be imitated. There is nothing new left in this licensing system which has not been tried at some time or other, somewhere or other, and which has not universally failed to give public satisfaction. I remember John Bright—(cheers)—said in one of his speeches on reform, "we have tried a class, let us try the people." What I say to-night is, "we have tried a class; we have tried magistrates, councillors, and barristers, they have all failed; let us try the people themselves." (Hear, hear.) If our statesmen have failed after centuries of tinkering at this legislation to make it satisfactory to the country, let us put in the hands of the people of the localities interested a weapon which they may use for their own self defence and protection. (Hear.) If you are determined that the magistrates or any other body shall retain in their hands this weapon of offence, all I can say is, give the people also a chance and give them a weapon of defence. Such a bill is the Permissive Bill; and I hereby give notice that we intend, as soon as ever practicable to re-introduce that bill into the House of Commons. (Hear.) Mr. Bruce may do what he likes, and I am not quite sure, Mr. Chairman, that you thoroughly or intimately knew the Permissive Bill from something you said when you were speaking, but I want to explain that the Permissive Bill has nothing to do with licensing. It does not propose to give the people the power to stop individual licenses here and there—invidiously to pick out a house and say, "we will have this house and we won't have that;" but it gives them the power of saying, "we object to you magistrates licensing any place whatever in this district." Now, what is the licensing retained for? Surely it must be granted for the public good. If a license for the sale of drink is granted for the good of private persons, then it is an outrage on a free people; if on the other hand you admit that it is granted for the public good, then refusing the public a voice in the matter of deciding whether licenses shall be granted or not, is an outrage on an intelligent people. (Hear.) The people have never had a chance of rising in the social scale so long as this frightful incubus of the liquor traffic has been saddled upon them. And for whom is it kept up? I always admit, in defending the Permissive Bill, that if it were carried into operation, it would very likely cause inconvenience, annoyance, and perhaps suffering to some persons who are in the habit of consuming intoxicating drinks, not in excess, but after a manner they believe to be necessary for their health and comfort. I know that many people consider that life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness consist in drinking—moderately, of course. Those persons would suffer inconvenience. But surely in a matter of this sort the majority should be considered; and I often think in arguing this question, that we forget what a large majority there is really on our side and interested in our legislation. I will not take merely the male population, but look at all the women and children in their wretched and miserable homes. Would not the women be unanimously for this measure, which would relieve them of their burdens? and because I feel that this measure is to do good, to bring blessings to them, to succour them, and to raise all the desolate and oppressed, therefore it has my ever-increasing and warmest support. It seems hard that simply for the sake of a very small minority who would be injured by our legislation, and for the sake of those who are making fortunes by the sale of this drink, such heavy burdens should be laid upon the backs of the people of this

country. Well, we are determined, sooner or later—not by the Permissive Bill—to remove the burden; the Permissive Bill would do nothing by itself—but we are determined to obtain such a measure as the Permissive Bill—which would enable people, if they be so minded, to remove from among them this burden and this curse; and I think, sir, to obtain this Act is worth a little suffering and labour. I will advise you in pressing it on to disregard altogether the ridicule of the ignorant and the revilings of the interested, and also the warnings of the timid. They will never do you any harm; they never did me any harm.

Dare to be right—dare to be true—
 Each has a work which no other can do;
 Do it so bravely, so wisely, so well,
 That angels in heaven the story shall tell;
 Stand for your honour, your conscience, your faith,
 Stand to your colours till victory or death!

Mr. JACOB BRIGHT, M.P.—Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: If any of you had happened to stand at the door of the House of Commons after your intrepid leader took his last division upon this question you would have looked upon a scene of some excitement. I suspect you would have been led to think that a great Parliamentary success had been achieved. There is always a steady light in the countenance of Sir Wilfrid Lawson (cheers) as there is in the face of every human being who pursues high objects by pure means, but on this occasion he was more radiant than usual. Then there was present your able and indefatigable representative, Mr. Raper. He always carries about with him, as you know, an atmosphere of hope and a promise of success; but he, too, on the occasion to which I refer, was even more buoyant than he appears to-night. Well, was there any cause for this mutual congratulation on the part of your leaders? I believe there was an adequate cause. Putting the number of votes which Sir Wilfrid Lawson obtained to the “pairs,” the increase of members found supporting your object was very considerable; and looking, as has already been said, to the comparatively small number of members who thought it worth while to come down to the House to vote against him, it certainly does look as if—by some mode or other—the feelings of the constituencies of the empire were undergoing a change upon this question. Very soon after the vote—I forget whether it was on the same day or the day following—I happened to be in conversation with a member of the House of Commons who is one of the most distinguished brewers in the world. He said—referring to your party—“I know they will succeed.” (Great applause.) He repeated the expression. He said, “I do not disguise the fact from myself, they will succeed.” And then he went on and conversed very intelligently upon the subject, but not in a sense which accords with your views. Twelve months ago, when I stood upon your platform, I was not sanguine that a licensing measure would be immediately brought into Parliament. I remember saying, “Next session, or next but one, we shall have such a measure;” but to-night I have a right to say, that we shall have it in the next session of Parliament. But then, what will be its character? Well, you know as well as I do that its character depends more upon the operation of this association during the next six months, than upon any other single cause that could be named. (Cheers.) Whatever that bill may be when it enters the House of Commons, it will be more or less adapted to the object which you have in view, according to the influence which, in the meantime, you can bring to bear upon the constituencies of the three kingdoms.

Now, I think you have a right to ask Government to legislate on this matter in some degree consistently with its legislation upon other questions during the last two years. It has legislated boldly and comprehensively upon the subjects that it has undertaken. Let it do the same upon this question. If it does not, I agree with Sir Wilfrid Lawson that the effort will be a failure, and that the time will be lost. Let me for a moment illustrate what I mean. Parliament dealt with the Irish Church. Well, how did it deal with it? It did not deal with it in the interests of bishops and archbishops and sinecurists. Parliament dealt with the Irish Church according to the views of those who are in favour of free churches. (Cheers.) Take the question of the Irish Land. Parliament did not enter into that question in order to please the Irish landlords—although I do not doubt that it will be of great use to them—but Parliament entered into that question in order to secure the tenant. Take the Education Bill. That bill was not passed in the interest of ignorance. It was passed in the interest of those who wish to have an instructed people, and whatever may be its shortcomings, never forget that it is an enormous step in the right direction which can never be undone. It provides a school-seat for every boy and girl in the country, and it gives to communities of this kingdom the power to constrain the children to occupy those seats. Therefore, if you have an uninstructed people in the future, it will be the fault of the people themselves. You say, let us have a bill in regard to the licensing system. Then let us have a bill upon this question which shall also make the people masters of their own destiny. (Great applause.) If they (the Government and Parliament) take up this great question, they take it up because the friends of order, of morality, and of public virtue ask for a change; and I say it will be inconsistent with the legislation of the past two years unless the Government of this country bring in and push forward a bill which shall receive the sanction of that large class which makes a bill imperatively necessary. Sir Charles Trevelyan recalled to our minds the beautiful words of our Common Prayer—"Lead us not into temptation, but deliver us from evil." What a multitude of places of worship there are in this country; they differ in faith, in creed, and in observances. They differ in a marvellous degree, but I believe that beautiful prayer is common to the whole. (Cheers.) But I confess when I see how temptation to do evil covers the land, and how slow, as a people, we are either to reduce those temptations, or to establish counter temptations of a better and higher kind, I sometimes wonder whether that prayer is lifted up on high in an intelligent spirit, or whether it is only the utterance of so many barren words. (Great applause.) I shall not detain you longer. (Cries of "Go on, go on.") But though I, with one of my colleagues in the representation of Manchester, Mr. Birley, have not been a worker in your special cause, although I have had some interest in the great general temperance question, I believe I am as anxious as any man in this room that the time should speedily come when such a measure should be obtained of Parliament, as shall be an adequate compensation for the labours of gentlemen who are now around me upon this platform. I know something of the burdens and anxieties of public life. I am quite sure that Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and all his followers here, have had their full share of those burdens. Let us hope they may soon meet with their reward. Another movement, unworthy of the support of intelligent men, has succeeded whilst you have been condemned to wait. The Admiralty and the War Office, aided by the least reflective portion of the medical profession, got up a

conspiracy—(cries of “shame”)—and obtained from Parliament, and from successive Governments, legislation more arbitrary, more odiously unjust than any we have ever known in this country. (Great applause.) If Parliament will listen to those men, who, in the secret pursuit of a peculiar object trample in the dust the most sacred feelings of the womanhood of England—I say if Parliament will listen to those men, with their dark purposes—(cheers)—shall it much longer turn a deaf ear to you, who, in the broad light of day, get millions of the best portion of your fellow subjects to sanction your cause. (Tremendous cheering.)

The Ven. Archdeacon SANDFORD, B.D.—Mr. Chairman, my countrymen, and my country-women: I little thought a year ago, when my life was despaired of, that I should have the happiness of witnessing another of these glorious celebrations which I have ever contemplated with delight—from which I have always been wont to carry away lessons of instruction and motives for my inspiration. I can truly say, my friends, that although for a long year I have been laid aside from active efforts in behalf of this glorious association, I have never wavered or faltered for a moment—even in the languor of sickness—from my devotion to its interests, and that all I have learned since—and throughout my long past life—has tended to fortify and intensify my conviction that if you would meet the tremendous evil which oppresses the community, and relieve our working-classes from the curse and slavery of intemperance, you must carry the principle of that Permissive Bill which has been introduced by Sir Wilfrid Lawson and his patriotic colleagues, and of which, I am sure you will feel with me, he is the foremost, the chivalrous, and the eloquent exponent. Ladies and gentlemen, it is not for me to congratulate you to-night upon the signal success which has recently attended the efforts of your friends, both in and out of Parliament, and which are evidenced by the adhesion of new and influential supporters, by the decrease and disappearance of opposition, by the altered and even patronising tone of some of our liberal journals, by, above all, the quickened vigilance of our licensing authorities, and the activity with which our opponents are mustering their forces, and setting their houses in order. I am quite aware, ladies and gentlemen, that my only claim to your attention in this meeting to-night is the fact that I have been instrumental on behalf of the people and the Church in collecting an array—important and imposing—of evidence upon this most momentous subject, and when I tell you that these testimonies amount to seven ponderous quarto volumes, you will not wonder that my labour in collecting, collating, and studying these documents should have brought me to the borders of the grave. I am very thankful to my numerous correspondents for the assistance they have rendered me in this inquiry, though I have often felt that they themselves sometimes mistook and confounded causes and effects, and, that the intemperance, for which their remedies were proposed, was itself the very reason why the remedies were futile. For instance, the reason why education—which, with some men is a universal panacea for all conceivable ills—has failed in its influence upon the working-classes of the nation is, that intemperance itself is the cause why education has not been adopted. Again, the reason why sanitary improvements, and why domestic comfort are not patronised by the working classes in many instances, and why the happiness of home is so often blighted, is that the resources which ought to be devoted to increasing the comforts of the family are expended by the workman on drink. The reason, lastly, why different schemes for

the recreation and instruction of the people have proved abortive is, that the gin palace and the public-house and the beer-shop appear to possess more potent attractions than the places in which instruction and recreation are offered to the poor. And therefore I have been forced to the conclusion, which has been come to also by the Committee of Convocation, that if you would remove the results of the temptation from the people, if you would disenthral them from the slavery by which so many of them are oppressed, you must remove the temptations themselves out of the way, you must put an end to the intoxicating drinks which make men drunk. Now I wish that this simple truth should be the purport and the amount of my few words to-night. I want you Christian gentlemen and Christian ladies to din this truth in the ears of the members of the legislature, and in the ears of the members of the administration. Our friend, Mr. Bruce, the Home Secretary, is an amiable and a benevolent man, but he wants to have this fact forced home to his conscience, and generally to be galvanised upon this question. Our Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, is an accomplished statesman, and distinguished by many public and private virtues, but he wants to be made by the people themselves to feel that the nation is determined that the liquor traffic should be brought to an end, that intemperance, which is the opprobrium and the disgrace of our people, should be put an end to by removing the stimulants to intoxication. Well then, I ask you, my friends, everyone of you, as has been put to you by other speakers to-day, what is your part in this glorious undertaking? And I may say, as an old man, with an honourable pride, that if each of you young men will bear your part as I have done, you will see that glorious consummation attained. Be it for us, my beloved friends, by an earnest, a persistent, a consentient, and a simultaneous endeavour, to remove this great curse from the land that gave us birth—let us teach the legislature and the country, that if they (its members) would possess the confidence of the British people; if they would retain the suffrages which have placed them in Parliament, if, above all, they would have the love and the blessing of the people, they must do this great thing in Parliament. For me, this glorious meeting, and this glorious platform, are presages of what I believe awaits us above. I am delighted on these occasions to be surrounded and supported by men of piety and power, of differing political creeds, and of various religious denominations. I trust that our co-operation, and our mutual charity in this work of God, is a pledge of our common brotherhood in Christ Jesus. (Cheers.) Yes; presages of our reunion in a better world where all our differences shall cease, and all our lines of demarcation melt away in the light and the life of our common and our everlasting home. (Very great and long-continued applause.)

Councillor A. M. SULLIVAN (Dublin), Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I think I cannot plead that I am unaccustomed to stand on a public platform. I confess that I am moved and almost unmanned upon the present occasion—my first visit to Manchester—as I survey this vast assemblage of earnest men, and recall the traditions of Britain's political history, that marks Manchester as the focus of public opinion in England. (Cheers.) I have been asked to move this resolution:—

“That this meeting recognises with deep interest the manifold signs of rapid and solid progress of the agitation promoted by the United Kingdom Alliance during the past year, especially in the fact that the majority in the House of Commons against the Permissive Bill was reduced from 106 in May, 1869, to

31 in July, 1870 ; and tenders its best thanks to Sir Wilfrid Lawson, Bart., the Right Hon. Lord Claud Hamilton, Sir Thomas Bazley, Bart., Mr. McCarthy Downing, and their colleagues who introduced the bill, and also to the whole of the 115 honourable members who voted or paired in its support during the recent session of Parliament." (Cheers.)

I am glad that the Committee have done me the signal honour of allowing me to come across from Ireland to perform an act of national gratitude and to tender in the name of my countrymen our grateful acknowledgements to that intrepid and heroic pioneer of this work—Sir Wilfrid Lawson. I am not an old man, but I have lived long enough to have seen the struggles, the griefs, the troubles, the embarrassments, and the sacrifices that the pioneers of good works and great questions have to face. (Hear, hear.) I have seen questions in their infancy—as ours has been—derided by their enemies, yet one day led to the enthronement of victory amidst the applause of thousands, who perhaps at the moment of triumph forgot the men that had fallen and the hearts that had been broken in achieving that victory. (Cheers.) But I hope, honest Englishmen, you will allow me to claim as a national tribute for my countrymen that, whatever their faults or their failings may be, they are never ungrateful to a friend. (Cheers.) I saw, in a hall almost as large as this, all Ireland representatively assembled to express that feeling of thanks and gratitude to one great representative Englishman, whose name is imperishably associated with Manchester—and upon that occasion we gave to him a foretaste of the ovation that Sir Wilfrid Lawson will yet receive in the green Island of the West. Like Cato the Censor, who began and ended his speeches with one short sentence, I refuse to speak upon this subject anywhere without almost beginning and ending with the words, "The people must be heard from upon this question." And what is this question? Eminently one of franchise; eminently one of emancipation—political franchise—moral emancipation. People of England, in your might you have made great strides toward the citadel of public liberty, and one by one you have stormed and carried by agitation—proceeding from this consecrated spot—great victories for popular liberty by the public will. (Cheers.) But this one—more glorious than all the rest—the complement, and the crown of all your past labours, has yet to be won; for I deny—repeating myself for the hundredth time—that any Reform Bill or any franchise conferred upon the people can be of true value as long as the legislature withholds from them this grand enfranchisement, which will entrust to the people that which is determined in their name and professedly on their behalf—but as a matter of fact, against their will—by a bench of magistrates. I heard your respected and honoured chairman this evening—taking his first manful plunge into this element of discussion—make a noble speech for a near fight; and as ours is a broad platform, we generously welcome here all new births of ideas upon this question. He was greatly captivated with the idea of an elected board determining this question, inasmuch as that principle, I believe, already existed in our constitution. Now, the nearest approach to any such proposal is to be found in the working of our Towns Improvement Act, under which the Boards are called upon to put into operation many enactments of an exceedingly stringent and, as it might be called, of "an oppressive kind." But I beg leave respectfully to remind the chairman that before a Towns Improvement Board can be elected to put these enactments into force in any locality the legislature has decreed that there must be, primarily, a previous consultive vote of the people. That is our case. Let me here parenthetically

say that, although a speaker preceding me has been generous enough to mention that if we in Ireland could have settled this question by our vote in the London Parliament the other day, we gave a majority for the question that would have settled it; nevertheless it is a pride to me to stand in this hall, in this vast city, and remember that its men have sent into Parliament three representatives sound upon this great question. Mr. Birley it was who spoke of the valuable effects of public opinion in correcting the drinking habits of society. Now, Mr. Chairman, I assert that if the Permissive Bill were carried to-morrow—if it were to become law to-morrow—even conceding something that is utterly improbable—that it were not put into force by the vote of the people in ten parishes in England, I maintain that the indirect effects of the discussion which it would provoke would be to accomplish the next best thing to total prohibition throughout the land. For how is public opinion made and formed? By discussions on the public platform, discussions in the workshop, discussions in the home, where the questions which truly and vitally affect the people receive their most earnest thought and their truest solution. Sir, suppose the people were called upon, district by district, to debate this question—each working man feeling that he had a franchise to go and vote upon this question—in how many homes in England would nightly be seen an argumentation upon this subject? Would not public opinion be thereby manufactured to an extent that would of itself render the present pitch of degrading drunkenness impossible. I believe that in the passing of this measure we have the true way of forming and correcting public opinion upon this question. Nor is ours a mere moral or philanthropical question. Some of the great organs of public opinion in England may to-morrow begin to treat us to some of those platitudes with which we are so familiar—oft refuted yet ever repeated. We may be told that we propose to establish a tyranny—there have been tyrannies in the world. The tyranny of a majority is deplorable, but the tyranny of a majority is revolutionary for the people of this kingdom. If the majority of those who pay the taxes complain that any public traffic lays burdens on their shoulders—I challenge the history of the British Constitution—I challenge the legislative records of the civilised world—to show me a warranty for making the majority pay for the gratification of the minority. I offer to all those reasoners a simple proposition. If they can show Sir Wilfrid Lawson any measure whereby the minority, desiring this gratification, can pursue it without leading directly to increased taxation, the disturbance of the public peace, corruption of the public morals, and increase of the public burdens, they are perfectly free, from a political point of view, to pursue their gratification to its end. And now, sir, before I retire, I would say that we entertain great hopes to-night, but let us not be carried away by enthusiasm to forget that the enemy is calling out his landwehr and his landsturm. The power opposed to us is desperate, and one of the reasons why I support with all warmth this vote of thanks to Sir Wilfrid Lawson and his colleagues is this—that a man who holds a representative position exhibits much moral courage and patriotism when, for the general weal, he sets himself up against a class interest; for the members of that class having pocket, tap, and till to defend, will leave their places of business and consider that they are still pursuing each his personal profit in hunting that man from public life if they can, while it may be that the general public, for whose weal he has braved ostracism, are lulled into fancied security, and stand quietly by at the Municipal or Parliamentary hustings.

Victory is sure to come; if not this year, we shall have it, nevertheless. We must not be disheartened by any check while we go forward full of hope. I ask you not to under-rate the circumstances around you. Society, in our generation, has grown up with all its social and hospitable customs thickly interwoven with drinking habits. All this cannot be reformed in a day, but if we go on as we have gone on, generations to come will find matters worse than they are now. I appeal to the legislature and to you to do something at least that will offer a prospect that the generation coming after us may see a different state of things, and that we, if we have been born slaves, may, if we must perish before the day of emancipation arrives, at least die hopefully and proudly, believing that liberty has been assured for our children. (Cheers.)

The Rev. G. W. OLVER (Wesleyan Training College, Westminster.)—Mr. Chairman, the only explanation which I can give of my presence here to-night is that I have some sort of connection with that name (John Wesley) so extensively, so justly, revered, and not least to be honoured, as the name of one who—born before his time—saw with a penetrating glance, where lay one of the greatest evils—if not the greatest of all—with which the Christianity of this country has ever had to contend; and if I, this evening, in speaking of the liquor traffic, were to give utterance to burning thoughts in burning words, I could not well use language more strong and, I am bound to say, language more true, than the words which were uttered more than one hundred years ago by John Wesley. (Cheers.) And yet, sir, I do not stand here to-night to reproduce his words so much as to give utterance as well as I can—under the intense excitement of this meeting—to my own thoughts. I do not wish to attempt to discuss the details of any measure which has been brought in, or which may be brought in, professing or attempting to deal with this gigantic curse. And yet, sir, there are words which have dropped from honoured lips this evening which really have challenged me to the very depths of my soul—"Existing interests!" What are they? Reference has been made to the battle fields of France; and the history of the Second Empire will hold its own place in the history of all ages. From 1852 to 1870,—the slaughter of the Boulevard and the battle fields of Woerth and Sedan, and those that yet may follow. How many have fallen—slain? I speak not now of the wounded—how many from beginning to end? Will you call them one hundred thousand, dead and gone? And is that the history of the eighteen years? Then look around you. Eighteen years have passed away, and here in Britain nine hundred thousand men have fallen under the terrible curse of drink. And how have they fallen? In other times and other lands men have stood, and fought, and died for wife and children—for hearth and home; but these, the fire of their hearths has been extinguished and their homes have perished with them. On other battle fields men have stood and fought, and bled, and died for their country. But what of these? Their country's wealth, their country's skilled labour, their country's virtue, their country's social health, has perished with them. In other fights, aye, and by the stake—for many a creed, and many a faith, for truth, and God—have our fellow-men gone down into the grave. But what of these? Their truth and their God have been ignored; helpless and hopeless they have gone down to the dark eternity. So have they fallen, and for whom? "Existing interests!" Sir, I stand here to impeach the liquor traffic of this country as a violation of the fundamental principle of the British Constitution. (Cheers.) The honorary secretary of this Alliance

will bear me out, if many a point of law, and interpretation of law, in the High Court of Chancery is not settled once and for ever, when a Vice-Chancellor or Lord Chancellor rules that such an interpretation is contrary to sound morals, and that no legal decision is ever allowed which is manifestly contrary to sound morals. (Hear, hear, and cheers) This liquor traffic is manifestly contrary to sound morals. I impeach it as an iniquitous injustice, an endowed traffic. An endowed traffic! Are not the gains of the working man, aye, and of the educated man, too—(cheers)—taken from his pocket or his horny hand, and put into the pockets of the traffickers? And who have to find that money in order to provide the food, the clothing, the shelter, and the education, which that money should have found? By imperial legislation the money is taken from the ratepayers' pockets and put into the pockets of the traffickers. I say it, Sir, deny it who will, the liquor traffic of this country is a traffic endowed by the imperial legislature. And how are we to meet this gigantic evil? By education? The Education Act, sir, will do much, and I will not refrain from saying wherever there are a score of English hearers to listen to my voice, that this country owes a debt to Mr. Forster that it never will be able to repay. But when we are asked to think that the Education Act will lift the people of England, then, Sir, I ask the solemn and earnest consideration of every thoughtful man, whether it is not rather the fact that instead of the Education Act destroying the intemperance, if you do not grapple with the intemperance, the Education Act will be a dead letter. I speak, Sir, as one who has much to do with Day Schools and Day School Education, and I know that what I say, all who have laboured in them feel, and will respond to, that the great difficulty in dealing with the education of the people has been the intemperance of the people. (Hear, hear.) Does any man doubt it? ("No, no.") No, because if he does there is a very simple test—go and find the teetotalers. (Cheers.) Are their's the children who wander about the streets without education? ("No, no.") Are their's the children who, when they have attended for a few days or weeks, are withdrawn; and the reply that has to be made continually is that "the parents cannot afford the fee, the father has taken to drink." There is a man there, the companion of my boyhood, Charles Garratt—(loud and long-continued applause)—thank you. He told us the other night of two little boys that were seen and heard talking together at the school,—I won't answer for their christian names, it does not matter. The one, calling the other by his name, said, "Halloo, you come to school?" "Yes, I have come to school." "Got an education aid ticket." You know what that means. And he told us how the little fellow drew himself up as tall as a duke, and as proud as a prince, with his neatly mended, though they had been tattered, garments, and he said, "No, father has signed teetotal." Education destroy intemperance! Sir, those words pierced my soul like an iron. What, are not our Day School children educated? Are not our Sunday School children educated? Are not our Church officers educated? Are not our tradesmen, generally, educated? Are not our medical men—(cheers)—our lawyers, and our barristers? Are not our Members of Parliament? Are not our aristocracy? And, Sir, I do not put them last, because intellectually they are highest, but because they ought to be in the fore-front of the good, are not the Ministers of our Churches educated? And, Sir, are there no Day Scholars? Are there no Sabbath Scholars? Are there no men of letters? Are there no men of high position in the Churches

dragged down to that terrible abyss? Oh, Sir, drink is the one terrible blight that blasts every effort, and by all that is true and noble, by all that is eternally holy, I implore—not the working men—the working men did not build this hall—employers and employed, working men and masters, men of every class, citizens of Manchester, one and all—I employ you, as a Christian Minister, if you have any regard for the welfare of your country, speed this movement. Stand to it with all the firm resolve, with all the latent energy which you can bring forth, and never give it up. (Great applause.) And

“The day will soon appear

When the might with the right, and the truth shall be ;

And come what there may to stand in the way,

That day the world shall see.”

(Renewed applause.) I rejoice, Sir, to know that I can stand here to-night, and I can say in the name of one of the largest assemblies of Christian Ministers that gather in this land—not in the name of a Church which is specially the representative of the free Churches of England—if you will allow me, Sir, to disclaim the compliment, but as one of the free Churches of England ; I am here to say that which was said by them in their last assembly, and that is “that in any measure which may hereafter be adopted, provision must be made that the ratepayers who bear the charges resulting from the prevalence of intemperance and its consequent pauperism and crime, shall also have power to control the issue of licenses for the sale of intoxicating drinks within their respective districts.” (Cheers.) And I make bold to say, whatever may be the machinery which may be employed in order to give effect to the control of the ratepayers, I and those who work with me, will not be content with any measure which will not give to the people of this country the power to control the expenditure of their own money, and to ease themselves, as far as may be, from the terrible burdens which now oppress them. (Applause.) Well now, Sir, it seems almost ungrateful of me to have said all this, and to have said not one word with reference to the resolution which I have been called upon to second. But the fact of the case is just this. I have been giving you the thoughts which have been rushing through my mind and heart as I sat there, and if I have travelled rather to the third resolution than to the second, I know you will forgive me when I tell you that until the chairman spoke of the name of John Wesley I had not the slightest idea but that I was to be called upon, according to the notice in my hand, to move the third resolution. Nevertheless, Sir, if Sir Wilfrid Lawson will allow me to say it, I can assure him that he has earned, and that he has secured the warmest and the most intense thanks of hundreds amongst the Methodist Ministry and of thousands and scores of thousands amongst the intelligent members of the Methodist Church. I beg to second the resolution. (Cheers.)

Mr. J. S. WRIGHT (Birmingham)—I am not sent here to tell you anything new upon this question—Birmingham would not presume so to teach Manchester—but simply to join with you in an expression of gratitude at the success which has been already achieved, and of thanks to those by whose instrumentality it has been so far successful. I can say, though, that Birmingham is glowing upon this question. We feel that, as on many occasions we have worked side by side with you, so we shall be able to work side by side with you on this great question. We cannot boast that we have three

Members of Parliament that are hearty upon it. One of them—unhappily away at the moment—is as much your member as our own, but the two others who formerly went into the Lobby against this measure have this year abstained from voting against it, and we have very good reason to hope that before long they will take the other step and vote in favour of it. Happily for me I have not to enter into any argument—I have to maintain no controversy, or even to defend any proposition. I have simply to support a resolution, recording facts and expressing thanks, and a right cheerful resolution it is. It shows us that the hours of darkness are passing away—that we shall soon revel in the light of day. We have won victories—not paper victories—not sham victories that may be reduced to the smallest proportion in the end, or be no victories at all—but a real victor is in the field. We have taken some of the outworks—many of the forts; yea, we have even made breaches in the ramparts themselves. It is true, not wide enough to enable us to take the citadel; but that is before us, and it will be taken in the end. Exercise patience and faith, and we shall yet triumph and succeed in storming the very heart of the enemy's citadel itself. The best thing to encourage our hope is that many of its defenders are beginning to feel that, after all, they will be obliged to capitulate. But do not let us exaggerate our victories. It may be that we have done much, but there is more to be done in the future. It is a great question—admitted to be so by both parties: those for and those against—and we must admit the fact that the great majority of the House of Commons are yet against us. But we should not be downhearted because of that. We should not be disheartened because the House of Commons is not with us to-day. What is the House of Commons but the representative of the people of England, and when the people of England are thoroughly in earnest throughout the length and breadth of this land, I make bold to say that the House of Commons will not be a single session behind them. We cannot complain of the House of Commons that we make ourselves, and I believe that, though not completely so, we can in the main say now, it is “the people's House;” and therefore when we want them to pass our measures we must see that we send men there who are like-minded with us, and prepared to go the lengths that we wish them. We must not in this matter be too impatient of immediate success. It may be that the present generation, or a good part of it, may pass away. The House of Commons is not an idle body. It passes a hundred or more Acts of Parliament every year. It has passed during the past generation many Acts that have been for the amelioration of the condition of the people, but its greatest Act has yet to be passed, and we believe it is one that will give a power to the people to do more to renovate themselves than anything that has been passed by the House of Commons during the present generation. We have, therefore, everything to encourage us. The great cause in our hands is founded upon truth, and if we are only faithful to ourselves, it will in the end be sure to triumph. There is at Rome one of the most beautiful and impressive works of art, which rivets the attention of all those who look upon it. It is the group of the Laocoon. There are three men there of the noblest form, whose limbs are entwined by the folds of a deadly serpent, and as we look at it we almost feel that the bones are being crushed, and we can imagine that the poison is racing through the veins from the fangs of that hideous monster. Is not that a fair, though horrible emblem of the effects of this monster—drink—upon the people of England? Have not millions?—do I exaggerate when I say “millions?” You

heard just now that 900,000—nearly a million—had gone down to the grave from the effects of this traffic within the last eighteen years. I do not exaggerate, then, when I say that “millions” of England’s sons have perished: stalwart men, men bearing God’s image, whose limbs have been crushed, whose blood has been poisoned, yea whose very life has been burst out of them by this deadly monster. (Cheers.) It is not for me to attempt to convince you of this. Are there some who doubt it? If they do we would call upon all the police offices to witness to the truth of what we say. We would appeal to all the gaols, workhouses, and lunatic asylums; to poor wretched, half-clad, down-trodden women that abound in our courts; to our shoeless, wretched, half-starved children, without education, save that they have been educated in the devil’s school. We would point to every corner almost of this our land where crime, where sin, where poverty, and where misery is found to exist as a consequence of it. I think we have hardened ourselves to do battle with this great evil. The Act that is to consummate our work—which is the Permissive Bill—must be wielded by the true-hearted people themselves. Oh that they may be faithful; oh that they may be earnest; oh that they may be persevering enough to conquer this, the great enemy to the well-being and happiness of our country. I know you will join with me in giving thanks to our noble, self-denying henchmen, who through evil and through good report have fought our battles upon this question. We, I hope, no more than the inhabitants of the Green Isle, are ungrateful to them; and I am sure you will accord to them a very hearty vote of thanks when this proposition is submitted to you. In conclusion, I would say to you: work as true men—as men of Manchester can work; commence anew and carry on the work as men of England can do, and we are satisfied that in the end the foe shall be slain, the captives shall be released (cheers); and little children shall clap their hands, and sorrowing women shall sing for joy, and old men shall not fear a pauper’s grave: and the youth, and the sinew, and the strength of our country shall in a renovated manner go forward in the paths of liberty, temperance, and righteousness. (Great applause.)

Mr. HUGH MASON, J.P., Ashton—Mr. Chairman, Ladies, and Gentlemen: I beg leave to move:—

“That this meeting, anticipating that the Government will fulfil their repeated promises to introduce a general measure dealing with the sale of intoxicating liquors, desires to express the opinion that no bill will be satisfactory or meet the necessities of the country unless it includes provisions to prevent the establishment or continuance of the liquor traffic in any parish or district against the will of its inhabitants. The meeting pledges its earnest support to all legitimate efforts to induce the Government and Parliament to deal with this important question in a righteous and patriotic spirit worthy of an enlightened Christian nation.”

—Mr. Chairman, I am a member of the United Kingdom Alliance. (Cheers.) I am also a teetotaler. (Applause.) First I became a member of the Alliance, and then, by a natural sort of training, I became a teetotaler. In that double capacity, I beg to say that I think I am a better man, mentally and physically, than I was before; and if any of you doubt that statement, if you will only try it for a short time, I think you will agree with it. I have also been, for the past 13 years, a diligent and anxious attender at Brewster Sessions as a magistrate, and as one of that body I declare to-night—with greater emphasis than I ever used the words before—that so far as my own experience goes, I do not think a more incompetent body could be entrusted with the regulation of the liquor traffic. (Great applause.)

On Monday last I was at the Assize Courts in Salford along with perhaps 70 other magistrates, and I heard, what is now becoming a very general thing, homilies upon the deplorable state of the people as regards this drinking question. But I maintain that the magistracy of the country are an irresponsible body, and therefore a dangerous body to the liberties and well-being of the great body of the people. They are not only an irresponsible body, but they are selected without any particular qualification in the eyes of the people who make them. One great political party comes into power for two or three years, has its "innings," and by a stroke of the pen it makes 150 magistrates in Lancashire. They are bowled out and the other side comes in, and it has to "square up" to make something like a decent balance; and that process is continually repeated. It is not only an irresponsible and a dangerous body, but it is also a selfish and interested body on this question of the drink traffic. My own observation enables me to say, so far as it goes, that I believe in my conscience at least 25 per cent. of the magistracy of the country are proprietors of public-houses (hear, hear); and that as regards those who are active magistrates of the country—being a very much smaller body than the general number—the proportion is very considerably enhanced. At Salford Sessions the other day, one of the oldest magistrates of this country—whose name has been mentioned to-night—Mr. Edmund Ashworth, but who is not one of us by any means upon this question, though like a great many men he is, I believe, in a kind of training upon it—when we were discussing a motion as to whether Heywood should be constituted a petty sessional division of the county, instead of the people going over to Bury or Rochdale, a few miles away, for the administration of business, he voted against that proposition, and one of his principal arguments was this—that if it were to be constituted a petty sessional division it would, of course, be a licensing division, and the nuisance and annoyance and pestering to local magistrates before the Brewster Sessions was such, that he advised them to let the people go to Rochdale or Bury, where the magistrates did not know them so well as those at home. We have heard it said to-night, upon this platform, that Parliament has boldly and comprehensively legislated upon great public questions during the last session of Parliament, and I agree with the statement; but why has Parliament boldly and successfully legislated? It is because the people have made up their minds that Parliament shall so legislate, and so soon as we who make these members of Parliament have made up our minds that this question shall be legislated upon, not another session of Parliament will pass over before it shall be legislated upon to the satisfaction of the people at large. That being the case, what are we to do? I, as a member of this United Kingdom Alliance, cannot bring any fresh arguments to bear upon this subject, but I can bring myself. (Cheers.) And inasmuch as this kingdom is now made into one gigantic democracy, when every man almost has a vote, it rests with that democracy to see that the great principles of the United Kingdom Alliance shall be embodied in an Act of Parliament. There is not a man in this room who believes that Acts of Parliament will make men virtuous—that is one of the platitudes which the enemy casts in our teeth—but we complain that Parliament will not let the people make themselves virtuous, but that it nurses and protects and licenses snares and pitfalls in the land; and the people, not Parliament, who determine to think on this subject for the people, only ask that they may have the power to make themselves virtuous and protect themselves from

falling into those snares and pitfalls. Those are my sentiments, my friends, and I call upon you to relegate this great question, as the other great questions were relegated, to the polling booth. When you do that, Lancashire will not be as it is, sending a large majority against Sir Wilfrid Lawson, but will be like the city of Manchester, to its infinite honour, sending all its members to follow into the Lobby the great champion of the United Kingdom Alliance. (Great applause.)

MR. GURNEY PEASE, J.P.—Ladies and Gentlemen: It is not for me, at this late hour of the evening, to occupy your time with many words. You have heard a great deal said, and a great deal well said. I can plainly see that you men of Lancashire need no instruction upon this great question—that you only want to press forward as your forefathers did of yore in the great battle of liberty; for my mind has gone back, as Mr. Sullivan's did, to your antecedents, and I believe and plainly see that you will not belie them, but that there will rise up in Manchester worthy sons of worthy sires to carry on this great battle of popular liberty. Is it not a two-fold battle of liberty?—political liberty, because we do not see why the interests of the few should be paramount to the interests of the many; of moral freedom, because we see that all around us our countrymen are enchained in the slavery of this national vice. It is to liberate them, that is our great motive in agitating this question. We say that those who pay the taxes have a right to say whether there shall be a need for paying those taxes or not; and we say—and I am thoroughly united with the mover of this resolution—that the magistrates are a most incompetent body to regulate this traffic. (Cheers.) I will give you an instance. I know a case where a new license was proposed for a village. It was opposed by all the influential members of the community in that place, and not only by the influential members of the community, but by a large majority of the adult population, who signed a petition against that license being granted. And what did the magistrates do? They gave the license in spite of the wishes of the inhabitants. According to the resolution which I hold in my hand, that is one of the things that we wish to prevent. And what was the reason given for that? One of the magistrates told me that because they had not sufficient opportunities of getting liquor in that village (although there were two public-houses without the new one) people came three miles, into the neighbourhood of his residence, to drink. I suggested to him that there was an easy mode of getting rid of the nuisance, and that was by shutting up the public-house. I want, then, that you men of Manchester should go forward in the great work you have undertaken—that you should fight one more battle for liberty; that you should drive one more usurper from his throne—a tyrant worse than any who went before—a tyrant who has got his position by weakening and demoralising his subjects, and who has loaded them with taxes of all descriptions, too onerous and too oppressive to be borne any longer. We speak in the resolution of legislation “worthy of an enlightened Christian nation.” I ask you whether our actions so far have been worthy of an enlightened Christian nation. We have been told by Lord Shaftesbury that there is an amount of demoralisation in society in this country which is fraught with danger to it; and I ask you from whence that demoralisation arises? If, then, we are worthy of our country—if we meet this question in a true and patriotic spirit, we must rise *en masse*—as one man—to drive the invader from our shores, and then we shall wisely restore peace and

virtue and prosperity amongst us. I would, as a young man, for a moment address myself to the young men now before me. (Cheers.) I fear that they are not as earnest as those that have gone before them. I think we have too much amongst us the idea that life is to be taken easy, and that time is to be spent over the novel or in the recreation room, entirely forgetting that life is real and life is earnest. I want our young men to go forward in this cause: not only to advocate prohibition, not only to look upon the question in a political light, but I want them to go in for "moral suasion" also, and do their best to raise the poor hapless victims of this liquor traffic from amidst the mire and the slums into which they have descended. Is there not a great work to do here. What think you of last year, of one in every ninety of the population in our large towns being arrested for being drunk, and not only for being drunk, but drunk and disorderly. And I ask you how many more there were who did not interfere with the policeman on the way home, but spent their savage barbarity upon the wife and children. (Hear, hear.) I want, then, that we should remember these things, and act worthy of an enlightened Christian nation, and do what we can to rescue these poor victims. I believe if we do that we shall be doing a truly Christian act. We shall in so doing be true followers of Him who walked this life always doing good. (Cheers.) I would have you not look too much to human agency, but, doing all that within us lies, look upward for a blessing from Him who must smile upon our endeavours. I believe if we go forward in this spirit, earnestly, constantly, and persistently, we shall at last gain our object, which is the total suppression of the liquor traffic. (Applause.)

Mr. S. POPE, Q.C.—Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen: Whatever our enthusiasm, and however great your patience, it is absolutely impossible to keep up this meeting any longer. (Cries of "Yes, yes," "Go on," "Go on," and applause.) There certainly never has been an annual meeting of the Alliance within my recollection (and, as you know, I have always attended them) when it was less necessary for me to make a speech. ("Go on," and cheers.) When I came into the hall to-night I did as has long been my practice—I asked Mr. Raper what I was to do. Everybody consults Mr. Raper. If you were occasionally to visit the Lobby of the House of Commons when any question bearing upon this liquor traffic—and sometimes others—is under discussion, you would find some of the members running out of the House, taking Mr. Raper aside to a little side table, writing a memorandum from his dictation, and then running back into the House, there to shoot off the powder with which he has supplied them. I can assure you that Mr. Raper takes a great deal larger share in Parliamentary debates than most of you would be aware of, unless you were to watch his proceedings in the Lobby. They call him "the stormy petrel." Whenever he appears there they know there is some discussion coming up in which some of them will be called to account by their constituents by-and-bye, unless they happen to be upon Raper's side of the question. So I consulted Mr. Raper, and he told me it did not much matter whether I said anything or not, and that he would supply me with my brief as the proceedings went on, and he has supplied me with my brief. He did so almost as soon as the meeting commenced, and on looking at the instructions—which of course I always do under such circumstances—I found the brief to consist of the same sort of instructions that I have received before. It was somewhat in these words, "Counsel is requested to watch the case on behalf of the Alliance." (Great applause.) I suppose that the truth of it really was, that inasmuch as some of our friends were speaking for the first time upon our platform, he was not quite sure that somebody should not be

behind to put the thing straight if they happened to go a little bit wrong. Well now, it so happens, I think, that we have come—at this time of the meeting, at all events—to a pretty unanimous conclusion that all has been going on very right, and that therefore it is not in the least necessary that I should take any part beyond the moving of a simple resolution. (“Go on,” and cheers.) I cannot help saying this, however, that it is wonderful to see how rapid progress is when once the first step is taken in the discussion of this matter. Although the speech which was made by the chairman was not upon all fours with Sir Wilfrid Lawson’s Permissive Bill, although it contained some suggestions which I own seem to me to be deserving of very careful and intelligent consideration—suggestions which some of you may not appear to approve of—yet I have no doubt whatever that the difference between us is simply a question of machinery and not of principle, and when that is the case we may expect, either upon one side or the other, an approximation to be gained—and we have a most valuable aid—and a most valuable and important gain, when we agree to unite in bringing our influence to bear upon Government in that direction ; and I am bound to say that knowing and remembering, as I do, the attitude which our friend Mr. Mason not long ago conscientiously took towards us, his speech has been to me a wonderful speech. When you remember that Mr. Mason is—as far as South Lancashire is concerned—probably the representative man of that school of politics with which our hardest and heaviest discussions have long been held—a man most difficult of access, and most unlikely to come over to our platform—when you heard him to-night, not only express himself in terms of cordiality, but of vigour and determination, which made one feel that it would be a very happy thing if we had him in the House of Commons to back Sir Wilfrid Lawson, and when you recollect how the bishop designate of Exeter this time last year halted a little in his speech, and I took the liberty of pointing out how little the difference was between us then, that within six months he, as Bishop of Exeter, found himself in that state that he could stand and declare himself ready, in his place in the House of Lords, to vote for the bill of Sir Wilfrid Lawson, I do not think we need despair that the resolution which I shall ask you to adopt will be productive of some success. It is “That copies of the resolutions adopted be forwarded by the chairman to the Prime Minister, the Home Secretary, and to the other Members of the Cabinet.” I do not think it will do Mr. Bruce any harm. Sir Wilfrid Lawson says, he has an awkward trick of considering things for a considerable length of time ; but he is like all other Ministers. He is accessible to pressure from without, and if you apply just the judicious amount of pressure which is necessary to squeeze out again the matter which he has taken into his consideration, I have no doubt that we shall find that his digestion has been satisfactorily performed. Now, you must really—(loud cries of “go on, go on,”)—no, I won’t make any speech further, but I will just say this, I will call the attention of the chairman to an article in the *Times* of to-day, which I am quite sure will interest him as an old Indian officer of the Government. It is an article “from our own correspondent” in Calcutta, purporting to give an account of an examination of the students, held in some one or other of the Colleges in India, the object of the correspondent being to show the child-like simplicity and directness of mind of the Hindoo undergoing a course of English instruction. It does seem to me that we may very often derive a great deal of instruction from child-like simplicity. Everybody who has ever examined a witness knows what a dreadful witness a child is if he is opposed to you, because he is sure to tell the truth, and you cannot bother a child ; his mind is so simple, so direct, that whatever the impression upon it is, he speaks out and nothing can shake him. Well, now the truth is that if we politicians would be a little more child-like, we should get at our remedies with a deal more simplicity. The truth is we bother ourselves with all sorts of considerations. That is the difficulty of the chairman. (Laughter and cheers.) I really mean it. I could trace almost the course through which the chairman’s mind had passed before it arrived at some of the propositions which he placed before us. There was “this difficulty” and “that difficulty” which to him as a politician and a statesman, seemed serious ones. To you, you know they are nothing. Put the same questions to you, and you would

make short work of them, and probably be right. But to a politician and statesman there is "this little difficulty" to be balanced against "the other little difficulty," and the whole thing seems to be so full of complications that you have to provide machinery for "this little bit" and "that little bit," and so the whole simplicity of the thing is lost. And now let me commend to you the way of dealing with this question that the Hindoo mind seems to have adopted in the course of enquiry in this college. This seems to have been the examination, as far as I can make it out. Dr. Mitchell, the principal in one of the colleges there, was examining the students and these are some of the questions. A great variety are given upon various subjects, but I will just read two or three, which will show you how a child-like mind goes direct to the point. This question is put to the students :—"Now, what do you think the young men of Bengal incline to, as a rule, after they leave college? I ask because there is a common belief that they often fall into drinking habits and are lost to society? A student (shaking his head gravely) : It is a sad truth, sir.—Well, what is the cause of it? Another young man : It comes from the west.—Then, is the balance one of good or evil for English education? A number of voices : Good !—Beyond question? Yes ; English education has set in motion truths, and is forcing social changes that cannot again be lost, and that will make India what it never was before.—What do you mean by saying that intoxication comes from the west ; the Englishmen you come in contact with are not drinkers? No ; we have two examples, one good and the other bad, and unfortunately some among us think the bad better worth imitating than the good."—Now, mark what follows : "Do you think the Government could do anything? It could prevent the opening of drinking places. (Great applause.)—Would that be good? Several : Yes. And one : Yes ; if it could be done without infringing liberty."—Well, now, you see that there is no balancing of considerations, except one, which is provided for. They do not trouble themselves about "this consideration" or "the other consideration." They go straight to the point ; that is exactly what we do. I do not care for myself, I do not think you care for yourselves, very much, by what machinery the thing is accomplished. All we desire and say is : "Give us the power to deal with this traffic to the extent of prohibiting it altogether if we choose," and you may depend upon it, if that power is given to us, we shall make short work of it without troubling ourselves with many difficulties. (Great applause.)

The resolution having been seconded by Mr. T. CLEGG, and carried, and the chair taken by Mr. BENJAMIN WHITWORTH,

Mr. PETER SPENCE said : The resolution which I have to move will require no words of mine to commend it to your approbation. It is—

"That the hearty thanks of this meeting be given to our worthy chairman." Sir Charles Trevelyan has long been known as one of England's most honoured public servants. He is known as one of the benefactors of India, and I am sure we will agree that he will be still more honoured by joining us in our great movement, and be still more a benefactor to his fellow-men by enabling us to carry the great question before us to a successful issue. I think the fact that Sir Charles Trevelyan has come here to be chairman of this meeting shows very decidedly his sympathy with us, while he has some scruples about the mode by which to gain the great object we have in view. I shall not detain you longer at this stage of the meeting, but propose "that the thanks of this meeting be given to Sir Charles Trevelyan."

Rev. S. A. STEINTHAL—Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentlemen : I have very great pleasure in seconding the resolution which has been put before us. I feel indeed that Sir Charles Trevelyan has not newly began the course of aiding us in this great work. All those who have been careful readers of the United Kingdom Alliance publications have already welcomed contributions from his pen, which have aided us in the great work upon which we are engaged, and we feel sure that the step Sir Charles Trevelyan has taken this evening will help on our movement by bringing him nearer and closer to those great principles which we all have at heart. He bears a name dear to all temperance reformers, and the more that name is connected with us the more do we rejoice. I have great pleasure in seconding the vote of thanks. (Cheers.)

Sir CHARLES TREVELYAN—Ladies and Gentlemen : You have done me

honour which I do not deserve, for in coming here I did it simply from a feeling of duty. I am proud of my fathers in this great work. The first temperance advocate with whom I became intimate was Father Mathew. I was very much united with him in the relief of the Irish famine, and it was impossible not to be attracted by the charms of his character, or not to be prepossessed in favour of any cause which he supported. Then I have had the advantage of endless discussions with your honoured chairman, whose fearlessness, whose self-sacrifice, and whose enlightened public spirit you all know. I have several reasons for thinking that success is not far distant. My first reason is that your Alliance is very ably conducted. I have seldom seen such efficient servants as your secretary and your Parliamentary manager. (Cheers.) And another reason is that you have shown by your conduct to-day that you are animated by a truly liberal and catholic spirit. That has been manifested by the tenour of the resolutions of the council and of this great meeting; and I, for my part, shall always feel deeply grateful for the kindness with which you listened to arguments which perhaps you are not always accustomed to hear. But I have been rather misunderstood. Some ladies and gentlemen here fancy that I have a special liking for the magistrates. Now, if I had a liking for them I certainly should not propose that they should have the giving of the licenses. You cannot touch pitch without being defiled, and I should be very sorry to see any real, warm friends of this cause entrusted with the duty of giving the licenses. I wish also to be understood that I have not proposed an Electoral Licensing Board. What I have urged is that there should be an effective veto. How that veto is to be provided is a matter of detail. Very possibly Sir Wilfrid Lawson's specific is better than mine. Since I have been here I have been reminded of one circumstance which certainly weighs greatly with me. We Cornish men have for our motto, "One and all," which in English is "a long pull, a strong pull, and a pull altogether." Now, of seven members for Cornwall who voted at All on your question, five voted in favour of it and only two against it, and I cannot help being prepossessed in its favour by that circumstance. There are great moral forces at work which will doubtless carry your cause at the top of the wave. At the present time there is a great party at work in this country who are determined to put down pauperism, the main cause of which is drink. There is another great party who are determined that the people shall be educated and ignorance dispelled, and the greatest enemy to education is drink. On the Continent of Europe there is a great earthquake in active operation which has a lesson for us. We inhabit two small islands bounded by the sea, and although we cannot be a large nation, we can make up in moral force that which is lacking in physical greatness. It is true we cannot become numerically strong in population like the United States of America, but we may become intelligent citizens and a cultivated nation. We may not be able to vie with France or Germany in military power, but we may promote moral greatness, which will make us nationally safe, and prepare the way of righteousness and peace throughout the world. (Great applause.)